

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated July 26, 2005, Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 17-21 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejections.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by *Yamaura* (6,034,779) or *Basavanhally* (5,281,301).

Claim 1 has been amended to highlight the differences between the present invention and the *Basavanhally* reference. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the input end has a length greater than the output end which is adjacent to the optical fiber. Angled side surfaces are used to couple the input end and the output end. Claims 1 and 10 both recite a monolithic body structure that has lenslets formed therein. The lenslets are formed on the input end. Figures 1-2 and Col. 6 of the *Yamaura* reference were cited by the Examiner. Applicants have reviewed these sections and can find only teachings of a non-monolithic structure. A lens substrate 2 is illustrated in Fig. 1. Spaced apart from the lens is an image forming lens 3. The lines between the lens 2 and the lens 3 are the rays that are ultimately directed to the image device 4. Thus, no monolithic structure is formed particularly with the limitations now set forth in the claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of these claims.

The *Basavanhally* reference has lenslet 16 on the surface of a lens substrate. Each lens corresponds to an optical fiber. That is, the lenses transmit to or from the optical fiber or ray. However, no teaching or suggestion is provided for a monolithic structure that has angled side surfaces coupling the input end and an output end. That is, the monolithic structure has a tapered surface to direct the light to an output end. Each of the lenslets directs the light to the same output end and to the optical fibers. Therefore, the limitations of Claims 1 and 10 are not set forth in the *Basavanhally* reference.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the *Scifres* reference (6,152,588). As mentioned above, the specific teachings of *Scifres* do not teach or suggest the angled structure and the monolithic structure described

above. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of *Scifres* in view of the remarks and amendments above.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 50-0476.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

By: 

Kevin G. Mierzwa
Reg. No. 38,049
28333 Telegraph Road
Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: 10/12/05